

## REMARKS

Claims 1, 7, and 11-14 have been amended to clarify the subject matter regarded as the invention. Claims 1-14 remain pending.

In response to the objection in paragraph 2 of the Office Action to applicants' claim of priority, the specification has been amended to delete the claim of priority to U.S. Patent Application No. 09/615,697.

The attached replacement sheets and the corresponding amendments to the specification with respect to claim 9 are believed to overcome the objections set forth in the Office Action to the drawings.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-6, 11, and 13 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Krawczyk, claims 7, 8, 12, and 14 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Chess, and claims 9 and 10 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chess.

The rejection is respectfully traversed. With respect to claim 1, Krawczyk describes breaking a single file signature up into a plurality of pieces, storing the pieces in different locations, and later validating a file that purports to be the original file by computing a current signature for the file and comparing the computed (current) signature to at least a subset of the stored pieces. Krawczyk at 2:40-57 & Figures 3-5. Krawczyk teaches using the same hash function to calculate both the previously computed signature (i.e., the one that is broken into a plurality of pieces each of which is stored in a different location) and the computed (current) signature of the purported file. Krawczyk at 2:40-57 ("genuine document is hashed into a fingerprint using a one-way cryptographic hash function" and "the test document is hashed into a second fingerprint using the one-way hash function"); 5:20-31 & Fig. 3 ("hasher 2" is used to

calculate both the signature stored in the “fingerprinting phase” and the computed signature generated in the “verification phase”). By contrast, claim 1 recites comparing a signature computed currently for a file being validated with both a “first file signature computed by the signature computing function” (i.e., the same function used to calculate the current “computed file signature”) and a “second file signature previously computed by *other than* the signature computing function” (emphasis added) (i.e., some function other than the function used to calculate the “computed file signature” and the “first file signature”). Krawczyk does not disclose comparing a currently computed signature with both a first stored signature computed using the same function used to compute the currently computed signature and a second signature computed independently of the first file signature.

To further clarify this distinction, claim 1 has been amended to recite that the analysis engine is configured to “determine the file is legitimate if the computed signature matches both the first file signature and the second file signature; and either identify the file as suspicious or subject the file to further analysis if the computed signature does not match the first file signature, the second file signature, or both.” No such multi-level analysis is performed as taught by Krawczyk because Krawczyk does not disclose a “second file signature” computed independently of the “first file signature”. See Application at page 74, line 1 – page 76, line 18. As such, claim 1 is believed to be allowable.

Claims 2-6 depend from claim 1 and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Claim 7 has been amended to depend from claim 1 and is believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above. Chess, on which the original rejection of claim 7 was based, does

not describe comparing a currently computed signature with two independently computed stored signatures for the file.

Claims 8-10 depend from claim 7 and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Claim 11 recites a method performed by the system of claim 1 and is believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Claim 12 has been amended to depend from claim 11 and is believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Claim 13 recites a computer program product comprising computer instructions for performing the method of claim 11 and is believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Claim 14 has been amended to depend from claim 13 and is believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Reconsideration of the application and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested based on the preceding remarks. If at any time the Examiner believes that an interview would be helpful, please contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,



William J. James  
Registration No. 40,661  
V 408-973-2592  
F 408-973-2595

VAN PELT AND YI, LLP  
10050 N. Foothill Blvd., Suite 200  
Cupertino, CA 95014